



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/628,146	07/28/2000	Nicolas Javier Di Prinzio	102	3537

7590

05/09/2003

GENE SCOTT  
PATENT LAW & VENTURE GROUP  
3151 AIRWAY AVENUE  
SUITE K105  
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

EXAMINER

HENDERSON, MARK T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3722

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*Belmury Beth*

*09/79/755*

*Elizabeth Antone*

*Greg McRae*  
*703-205-8000*

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/628,146

Applicant(s)

DI PRINZIO, NICOLAS JAVIER

Examiner

Mark T Henderson

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20 and 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3722

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Faxing of Responses to Office Actions**

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXING of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)305-3579. This practice may be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. After further consideration, the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is withdrawn. The previous allowable subject matter in claims 16 and 19 has been withdrawn.

Art Unit: 3722

2. Claim 1 has been amended for further examination. Claim 19 has been canceled.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said base" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the external surfaces" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Claim 4 recites the limitations "the admission" in line 2; and "the edge" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the surfaces" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the edges" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3722

8. Claim 14 recites the limitation "the form" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
9. Claim 15 recites the limitation "the external surfaces" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
10. Claim 16 recites the limitations: "the external surfaces" in line 2; and "the page marker" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
11. Claim 18 recites the limitations: "the external surfaces" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-12, 16-18 and 22, as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin (2,448,611).

Martin discloses in Fig. 3, 4 and 7, a magnetic clip marker comprising: a pair of rectangular wall members (6A and 6B, starting at point 12A and ending at fold line 22A to form

Art Unit: 3722

wall member 6A; and starting point 12B which ends at 22B to form 6B as seen in Fig. 7) aligned and joined together (although not directly, but at the ends (22) of wall members (6A and 6B) with strip 18, which forms a throat), wherein the wall members include a base portion (6A) and a clip portion (6B) completely overlying the base portion (6A, as seen in Fig. 2) to define a throat (seen in Fig. 7 which occupies triangle (12A-24-12B) and arranged to receive a page of a book; magnetic members (10) aligned with respect to one another and mounted to the base portion and the clip portion; a cover member (12A and 12B, seen in Fig. 4) or wedge members covering the magnetic members (10) on the overlapping base and clip portions to permit and guide the page (4) of the book to be received within the throat of the clip marker; external surfaces of the page marker provides an application for graphic prints or embossments (as seen in Fig. 1 and in Col. 1, lines 40-41); a signaling tab member or outer cover member (as seen in Fig. 1 and 7, in which the tab member starts at fold line (22) and ends at fold line (16)) which extends outwardly from the joined pair of wall members; and wherein the cover member (12A and 12B) covers both the magnetic members and the surfaces of the overlapping base and clip portions.

However, Martin does not disclose: a clip portion overlapping a base portion; a cover member being a film made of plastic or cellulosic material; the wall members are circular; and wherein the base portion or clip portion has a greater length than the other.

In regards to **Claim 1**, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the clip portion of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient to overlap the base portion. **A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within**

Art Unit: 3722

**the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results.** *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47.

In regards to **Claims 7 and 8**, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the cover members of any desirable material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

In regards to **Claim 10**, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the wall members of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47.

In regards to **Claim 12 and 22**, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to construct the wall members, the base or clip portion in any desirable size, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

13. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view Johnson.

Art Unit: 3722

Martin discloses a clip marker having all the elements as set forth in Claim 1 and as set forth above. However, Martin does not disclose at least one of the base or clip portion including an opening of ornamental design form.

Johnson discloses in Fig. 1 and 3, a clip marker having an opening (12) of an ornamental form to provide a line identification.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martin's clip marker to include an opening as taught by Johnson for the purpose of defining an index member associated with the opening.

In regards to **Claim 13**, a recitation of the intended use ("to provide a line identification on the page") of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

14. Claim 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Schwartz.

Martin discloses a clip marker having all the elements as set forth in Claim 1 and as set forth above. However, Martin does not disclose an external surface of the clip marker having an exterior surface oriented to bear a device providing a visual display for information



Art Unit: 3722

Schwartz discloses a clip marker (Fig. 22 and Col. 8, lines 60-68) oriented to bear a device providing a visual display of information (see Col. 4, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martin's clip marker to include a wall member surface oriented to bear a device providing a visual display of information as taught by Schwartz for the purpose of providing a supplement to be used to coincide with information in the book.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

15. Claims 20 and 21 are allowed.

16. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: No prior art of record discloses a magnetic clip marker comprising: magnetic members, a pair of wall members exhibiting a normally closed orientation with opposite surfaces of the wall members providing a continuous interior surface extending between a throat and terminal ends of the wall members; a cover member disposed along the interior surface to form a continuous layer extending from a first terminal end and around the throat and to a second terminal end; and including all of the other limitations of the independent claim.

Art Unit: 3722


**Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark T. Henderson whose telephone number is (703)305-0189. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:45 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, A. L. Wellington, can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax number for TC 3700 is (703)305-3579. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.



MTH

April 24, 2003



A. L. WELLINGTON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700



UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND  
TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND  
DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

LETTER RESCINDING NOTICE OF ABANDONMENT

A Notice of Abandonment, Form PTO-1432, was mailed on February 20, 2003 in patent application S.N. 09/628,146. The Notice of Abandonment alleged that applicant failed to file a response to the Office letter dated August 13, 2002.

A proper response to the Office letter in question and a three-month extension of time, filed February 10, 2003 has been received in Technology Center 3700 and has been properly entered into the application file. Accordingly, the Notice of Abandonment is hereby RESCINDED.

The application has been forwarded to the examiner and a new Non-Final Office action has been issued and is attached hereto. Any inconvenience occasioned by the delay in the proper handling of the response in the application file is regretted.

Andrea L. Wellington

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Technology Center 3700